STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: _____
CASES: _____

*** * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * ***

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: _____ Staff Member: *Sorin Alexanian*

Thomas Guide: _____ USGS Quad: *Lancaster West*

Location: *4555 WEST AVE G, LANCASTER, CA 93536*

Description of Project: *The General William J. Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan to be adopted by the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission. The plan provides a set of policies for use by the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission in evaluating the compatibility between future proposals for land use development in the vicinity of General William J. Fox Airfield and the potential long-range aircraft activity at the airport. The compatibility criteria defined by the policies are also intended to be reflected in the general plans and other policy instruments adopted by the entities having jurisdiction over land uses near the airport. The local agencies that have jurisdiction over land uses within the areas covered by this plan include Los Angeles County and the City of Lancaster. These jurisdictions will need to modify their respective general plans, zoning ordinances, and other local land use policies to assure that future land use development will be compatible with aircraft operations. The plan is prepared in accordance with requirements of the California State Aeronautics Act.*

Gross Acres: *20,933*

Environmental Setting: *The General William J. Fox Airfield Compatibility Plan primarily applies to land use planning and future development within the environs of General William J. Fox Airfield. The plan defines the affected locations as the airport influence area. A map depicting the proposed boundary of the airport's influence area is included in the plan document. The size of the airport influence area is about 2.7 miles by 9 miles around General William J. Fox Airfield.*

Zoning: *Various.*

General Plan: *Various.*

Community/Area wide Plan: *N/A*

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

The Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission can adopt the General William J. Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan without approval from any other agency, either state or local. Nevertheless, in preparation of the plan, the Commission and its consultants have been guided by the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook published by the California Division of Aeronautics as required by state law (Public Utilities Code Section 21674.7). Furthermore, implementation of the Compatibility Plan's policies can only be accomplished by the local jurisdictions which have authority over land use within the airport influence areas: Los Angeles County and the City of Lancaster. State statutes require these agencies to make their general plans consistent with the Compatibility Plan within 180 days, unless they go through an overrule procedure. The overrule procedure requires a two-thirds vote and specific findings must be supported.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

GENERAL COMMENT

The project is regulatory in nature. No physical construction would result from the adoption of the General William J. Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan or from subsequent implementation of the land use restrictions and policies. Although the Compatibility Plan would influence future land use development in the vicinity of the airport, it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of that development or the types of environmental impacts that would be associated with it. One possibility is that land uses in much of the airports' environs would remain unchanged from present conditions. On the other hand, the Compatibility Plan neither precludes new development near airports nor dictates the type of land uses which are allowed. The Compatibility Plan merely limits the density, intensity, and height of the uses so as to avoid creation of noise and safety compatibility conflicts with airport activities. Also, state law establishes a procedure by which affected local jurisdictions can overrule the compatibility policies set forth in the plan.

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
					Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	**FACTOR**	Pg				Comments*
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	☒	☐	☐	*a) Seismic / faults zones*
	2. Flood	6	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Fire	7	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Noise	8	☒	☐	☐	*e) Aircraft noise*
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Air Quality	10	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Biota	11	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Cultural Resources	12	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mineral Resources	13	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	☒	☐	☐	*b) Agricultural zoning*
	7. Visual Qualities	15	☒	☐	☐	
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Education	18	☒	☐	☐	*c) School sites*
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Utilities	20	☒	☐	☐	*f) Government staff workloads*
OTHER	1. General	21	☒	☐	☐	*c) Agricultural land*
	2. Environmental Safety	22	☒	☐	☐	*c) Sensitive uses; h) safety hazards*
	3. Land Use	24	☒	☐	☐	*b) Zoning*
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	26	☒	☐	☐	*b) Growth*
	5. Mandatory Findings	29	☒	☐	☐	*c) No environmental impacts*
						** Also see preceding general comment on page 2.*

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: _____

2. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?

3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)
EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE:Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? *The Compatibility Plan covers lands that are located within Seismic Hazard Zones 1(Severe) and 2 (Moderate). The San Andreas fault is located approximately nine miles south of the City's central core. The City's policies define which uses are permitted within each zone. The Compatibility Plan merely limits the density, intensity, and height of the uses. See also preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydro-compaction? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
h.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No Impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? *None.*

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☐ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW ☒ None Required

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in a high fire hazard area (Fire Zone 4)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☐ Fire Regulation No.8

☒ None Required

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *The Compatibility Plan establishes criteria which reduce the potential exposure of people to excessive aircraft-related noise by limiting residential densities and concentrations of people in locations near General William J. Fox Airfield. The plan does not regulate the operation of aircraft or the noise produced by that activity; the ALUC has no authority over such matters.*

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778 ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35
☒ None Required

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
	☐	☒	☐	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
☐ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
☐ NPDES Permit CAS614001 Compliance (DPW)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
h.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506 ☒ None Required

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? *None.*

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review ☐ Oak Tree Permit
☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report
☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES – 6 Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? *See preceding general comment on page 2. Furthermore, the proposed land use compatibility policies in the Compatibility Plan favor continuation of agricultural land uses in the vicinity of the airport.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)? *None.*

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use
☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (mid-block or intersections)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division
☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☒ None Required

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems? *The Compatibility Plan prohibits new schools within much of the influence area of General William J. Fox Airfield (existing schools are not affected unless expansion is proposed). The restriction is intended as a means of avoiding future noise and safety compatibility conflicts between aviation activity and school uses. Although local general plans do not specifically identify locations of future school sites, several parcels within the Compatibility Zones D and E are designated for public use. The Compatibility Plan does not prohibit school sites within these zones. Additionally, no schools exist within the airport's influence area.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee
☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's sub-station serving the project site? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

MITIGATION MEASURES/ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☐	☒	Other factors? *Adoption of the General William J. Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan would create a temporary increase in the workload of county and city planning department staffs as a result of the requirement to modify local general plans for consistency with the Compatibility Plan. An initial assessment of the inconsistencies which would need to be addressed are included in Exhibit 3J of the Compatibility Plan.*

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834
☒ None Required

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land? *See preceding general comment on page 2. Furthermore, as noted earlier, the proposed land use compatibility policies in the Compatibility Plan favor continuation of agricultural land uses in the vicinity of the airport.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation) ☒ None Required

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? *See preceding general comment on page 2. Additionally, all existing schools are located outside of the airport's influence area.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
h.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip? *The Compatibility Plan establishes the criteria by which safety hazards referred to in this issue would be evaluated. These criteria reduce the risk of exposure to the hazards of an off-airport aircraft accident by limiting residential densities and concentrations of people in locations near General William J. Fox Airfield. The risks of aircraft accident occurrence are reduced by limitations on the height of structures, trees, and other objects which might penetrate airport airspace as defined by Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77. The Compatibility Plan also seeks to minimize the consequences of an off-airport aircraft accident by requiring a percentage of the land area in critical areas near the airport to remain open and reasonably suitable for a survivable emergency aircraft landing.*

SETTINGS/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
i.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
j.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan ☒ None Required

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?

See preceding general comment on page 2.

b.	☐	☐	☒	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?

State law (Government Code 65302.3) requires each local government having jurisdiction over land use within locations addressed by an airport land use compatibility plan to modify its general plan and any applicable specific plan for consistency with the compatibility plan (or to go through the special process required to overrule the airport land use commission). With regard to the draft General William J. Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan, this requirement would apply to the County of Los Angeles and the City of Lancaster. Exhibit 3J of the Compatibility Plan contains an initial evaluation of local general plans consistency with the Compatibility Plan policies. This evaluation indicates that certain modifications to the general plan of the affected jurisdictions would be required as a consequence of ALUC adoption of the Compatibility Plan.

For a general plan to be considered consistent with the Compatibility Plan, it must do both of the following: (1) it must not have any direct conflicts with the Compatibility Plan and (2) it must contain criteria and/or provisions for evaluation of proposed land use development situated within an airport influence area.

Direct conflicts most often occur with respect to land use designations and/or densities which are unacceptable for their proximity to the airport. Elimination of these conflicts will require shifting allowable residential densities to certain locations around the airport to ensure consistency with the Compatibility Plan's criteria. Only proposed land uses are affected. The ALUC has no authority over existing land uses even if those uses do not conform to the proposed compatibility criteria. The Compatibility Plan would be applicable to these locations only if redevelopment or extensive reconstruction were to be proposed.

The second requirement addresses the common problem that local general plans and/or other policy documents do not contain criteria for evaluating other compatibility factors such as limits on the height of structures and the intensity (number of people per acre) of land uses. The project evaluation requirement can be met in any of several ways identified in the Compatibility Plan. Options include: (1) incorporation of the ALUC's compatibility criteria into the general plan, zoning ordinance, and/or other local policy document; (2) adoption of the Compatibility Plan by reference; and (3) agreement to submit certain major land use actions to the ALUC for compatibility review.

Although ALUC adoption of the General William J. Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan would establish compatibility criteria which would be applicable to county and city, the Commission does not have authority to implement the Compatibility Plan. This responsibility rests with two land use jurisdictions through the general plan consistency process described above. Because the affected jurisdictions have multiple options with regard to how to implement the compatibility criteria, as well as the option to overrule the ALUC, the specific land use environmental impacts which may result cannot be determined at this time. Only a general evaluation of the impacts, primarily with regard to housing, is presently possible (see Other Factors - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation page 26). Each jurisdiction will need to assess these impacts at a higher level of detail as part of the CEQA process associated with the general plan changes and/or other policy actions taken in response to the Compatibility Plan.

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	☐	☒	☐	Hillside Management Criteria?
	☐	☒	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	☐	☒	☐	Other? *None.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project physically divide an established community? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *None.*

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?

The Compatibility Plan does not directly or indirectly induce population growth either regionally or locally. In fact, its provisions limit the location, distribution, and density of residential and nonresidential land uses in the airport's environs to minimize potential noise impacts and safety concerns. Nevertheless, to the extent that such restrictions conflict with currently adopted county and city land use plans, adoption of the Compatibility Plan could cause population growth to be shifted to locations different from where now planned. As indicated by the data summarized in the following paragraphs, the net effect of any such shifts would be small relative to the overall projected growth in the county and city. These impacts are judged to be less than significant.

The following analysis examines the effects which implementation of the Compatibility Plan policies could have on the number of allowable new residential dwelling units in the vicinity of the airport. Comparisons are made between the number of dwelling units allowable under the Compatibility Plan criteria and the number possible under applicable local general plans and zoning.

The analysis also assumes the numbers of dwelling units and residential parcels to be equivalent. This assumption simplifies the analysis and, for most subdivisions, the two numbers are identical. For multi-family developments, the number of impacted parcels has been calculated as if each dwelling unit would be on its own parcel, thus the numbers are again equal. Where some differences could occur are with respect to secondary dwelling units. The lost potential for secondary units on existing large parcels has not been reflected in the calculations, but this impact is tiny relative to the overall numbers discussed.

- *Compatibility Zone A: The entire zone (some439 acres) lies within the city limits. The majority (95 percent) of Zone A is on airport property. The balance (about 21 acres) is designated for light industrial uses. The Compatibility Plan thus would have no effect on the number of potential new residential dwelling units.*
- *Compatibility Zone B1: Some 636 acres are within the city limits and are designated for light industrial uses. The number of potential new residential dwelling units would not be impacted by this plan.*
- *Compatibility Zone B2: Entire zone (some248 acres) lies on airport property. Future residential land uses would not be affected.*

> *Compatibility Zone C: Nearly 1,582 acres of land are within this zone. Zone C limits residential densities to 1 dwelling unit per 5.0 acres (0.2 d.u./ac.) or a total of 316 dwelling units (1,582 x 0.2). Of the 1,582 acres in this zone, the majority (some 1,367 acres) lies within the County's jurisdiction and is designated as non-urban residential with a minimum lot size of 2.0 acres (0.5 d.u./ac.). The balance lies within the existing city limits: 160 acres are zoned non-urban residential (0.4 to 2.0 d.u./acre) and 55 acres are zoned urban residential (2.1 to 6.5 d.u./acre). Based on the jurisdictions' allowable densities, up to 1,361 dwelling units (1,367 x 0.5 + 160 x 2.0 + 55 x 6.5) could be developed within Zone C. The Compatibility Plan would preclude this density. In total, implementation of the Zone C criteria would eliminate up to some 1,045 new residential dwelling units (1,361 minus 316) that could otherwise be created under current land use planning and zoning. However, the number of dwelling units that would be lost as a consequence of implementing this plan is theoretical. That is, the number does not consider that about three quarters of this area has been subdivided into parcels smaller than the 5.0-acre minimum required by this plan. The Compatibility Plan explicitly allows a dwelling to be built on any legal lot of record even if the parcel size is less than the indicated compatibility criterion. To compensate for any potential loss in residential dwelling units, zoning in areas beyond Zone C may need to be modified to allow for increased residential densities.*

> *Compatibility Zone D: Of the 3,400 acres of land in this zone, the majority (some 2,405 acres) lies within the County's jurisdiction and is designated as non-urban residential with minimum lot sizes of 2.0 gross acres (0.5 d.u./ac.). The balance lies within the city limits: 782 acres are designated as non-urban residential (0.4 to 2.0 d.u./acre) and 195 acres are designated as urban residential (2.1 to 6.5 d.u./acre). The Compatibility Plan provides two development options for Zone D. The low-density option limits densities to no more than 0.2 dwelling units per acre (i.e., an average parcel size of at least 5.0 gross acres). The high-density option requires that densities be greater than 5.0 dwelling units per acre (i.e., an average parcel size less than 0.2 gross acres). The concept is that higher densities will produce higher ambient noise levels and thus lower the intrusiveness of aircraft overflights. Based on the jurisdictions' allowable densities, up to some 4,034 dwelling units (2,405 x 0.5 + 782 x 2.0 + 195 x 6.5) could be built within Zone D. The Compatibility Plan would restrict development to 680 dwelling units if the entire area were held to the low-density option. Therefore, some of the area would need to be zoned at the higher density option to compensate for the potential loss in residential dwelling units.*

> *Total Airport Influence Area: Implementation of the Compatibility Plan could enable higher residential densities in some locations and would require lower densities in others compared to the densities currently planned. The net effect of these shifts in residential densities would not affect the projected housing needs. The County's and City's general plan housing element estimate over 52,200 dwelling units for the unincorporated areas and nearly 9,300 dwelling units within the existing city limits for Year 2005, respectively. Thus, the overall impact of the Compatibility Plan on potential housing development within the airport's influence area is judged to be insignificant.*

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

No housing or people will be displaced as a result of the Compatibility Plan's adoption. The Compatibility Plan does not apply to existing housing. Moreover, it explicitly allows construction of single-family houses on legal lots of record where such uses are permitted by local land use regulations. Also See preceding general comment on page 2.

IMPACTS/SETTINGS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *See preceding general comment on page 2.*

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment,** or **recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? *Because the Compatibility Plan is regulatory and restrictive in nature and will not cause any physical development to occur, it has no potential to create cumulatively significant environmental impacts. Rather, the Compatibility Plan addresses potential noise and safety impacts and other airport land use compatibility issues associated with potential future development which other public entities or private parties may propose for the vicinity of General William J. Fox Airfield. Without adoption of the Compatibility Plan, the adverse impacts — both to airport functionality and to community livability — of allowing incompatible development to occur may be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The Compatibility Plan thus, in effect, serves as a mitigation plan designed to avoid impacts which might otherwise be cumulatively significant.*

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact